

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Susan Reeves, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | Civil Action No.: 4:10-cv-1351-TLW-TER |
| |) | |
| Michael J. Astrue, |) | |
| Commissioner of Social Security, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| |) | |

ORDER

The plaintiff, Susan Reeves (“plaintiff”), brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the defendant, Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner” or “defendant”), denying her claim for Disability Insurance Benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. (Doc. # 17). The plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. Objections were due July 28, 2011.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this

Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 17). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 2, 2011

Florence, South Carolina